

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/212,852	12/16/1998	NEERAV N. DALAL	SAMS01-00063	7782
23990 7	7590 03/01/2005		EXAM	INER
DOCKET CLERK			VANDERPUYE, KENNETH N	
P.O. DRAWER 800889 DALLAS, TX 75380			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				TATER NOWIDER
		• •	2661	
		DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	09/212,852	DALAL, NEERAV N.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kenneth N Vanderpuye	2661			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed  ays will be considered timely.  m the mailing date of this communication.  JED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 2-8,10-15 and 18-35 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 2-8,10-15 and 18-21 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 22-27 and 29-34 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 24, 35 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Date Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2661

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### **Double Patenting**

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 7, 15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim28, 35. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2661

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art.(Fig. 2)

The admitted prior art teaches a partitioned selection and SDU comprising:

A first controller associated with a first one of said plurality of base stations(Fig. 2, SDU, 201 is associated with a base station) capable of performing radio link control protocol functions related to wireless communication links between said first base station and at least one of a plurality of mobile stations(Fig. 2@206), a second controller associated with an MSC of said CDMA wireless network capable of performing physical layer protocol functions(Fig. 2@142, switch performs physical layer functions) related to transmission of wireline data comprising at least one voice traffic and data traffic (MSC switches voice data) between said CDMA wireless network and a wireless network coupled to said CDMA wireless network(PSTN), wherein said first controller is disposed in said first base station(SDU, 201 is in base station) and said second controller is disposed in said mobile switching center(switch 142 is in the MSC).

Art Unit: 2661

Claims 23, 30 are rejected because the admitted prior art teaches...wherein said RLP functions comprise selection of preferred ones of incoming wireless traffic frames from said base station.(Fig. 2@202)

Claims 24, 31 are rejected because the admitted prior art teaches ... wherein said RLP functions comprise controlling a transmission power of a selected one of said plurality of mobile stations(Fig. 2@212)

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-26, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Smolik(6,381,455).

Claims 25-26, 32-33 are rejected because the admitted prior art fails to teach vocoding as one of the physical layer functions in th eMSC. This taught by Smolik(Fig. 1@16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Smolik with the admitted prior art for the purpose of decompressing/compressing voice data. The motivation being to reduce redundancy.

Art Unit: 2661

Claims 27, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Hammar(5,436,900).

With regards to claims 27, 34, the admitted prior art fails to teach transcoding as one of the physical layer functions in the MSC. This is taught by Hammar(Fig. 22, TRABL). It would have been obvious to ocmbine Hammar with the admitted prior art to the purpose of encoding/decoding. The motivation being to improves channel efficiency.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-18, 10-15, 18-21 are allowed. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth N Vanderpuye whose telephone number is 571-272-3078. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(7:30-5:00) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KNV 2/25/05

KENNETH VANDERPUYE PRIMARY EXAMINER